



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,620	04/24/2006	Thor Haavic	1935-00170	5574
26753	7590	01/04/2008	EXAMINER	
ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP			ADAMS, GREGORY W	
100 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 1100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202			3652	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/559,620	HAAVIE, THOR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory W. Adams	3652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 8-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 8-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 December 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/5/05; 4/24/06.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: the text "with a to the" in line 3 is grammatically unclear. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Claim 9, line 2 recites "possibly truncated cone" which makes optional a truncated cone. The alternative to a truncated cone is a cone that is not truncated. However, Applicants figures only disclose a truncated cone. Therefore, a cone that is not truncated must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8, line 8 recites "the first vessel" but since the recitation occurs in the preamble as part of an intended use limitation it is unclear whether a first vessel is required. In other words, it isn't clear whether claim 8 is directed to the subcombination personnel capsule or the combination personnel capsule and first vessel. For purposes of examination it is assumed that claim 8 is directed to the combination. Applicant is respectfully requested to clarify.

Claim 9, line 2 recites "possibly truncated cone" which makes optional a truncated cone. If "possible" leaves doubt as to whether the subsequent limitation is present one alternative to a truncated cone is a non-truncated cone. However, Applicants figures do not discloses a non-truncated cone. Thus, the implication by the word "possibly" of an alternative is indefinite.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "the attachment point" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 11 recites the limitation "the guideline" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8-9 & 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Edwards (US 1,786,109).

With respect to claims 8 & 13, Edwards discloses a personnel capsule device characterized in a -

- a capsule device 1 has an downwardly open internal conical enclosure 9,
- an open enclosure having its largest cross section facing downwards, e.g. towards the first vessel 1, and where a positioning and landing device 2 protrudes upwardly from a first vessel 1 and into an open enclosure when a capsule device is in a docked position.

With respect to claim 9, Edwards discloses positioning and landing device 2 is formed as a possibly truncated cone.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of MacDonell et al. (US 4,395,178).

With respect to claim 10-12, Edwards does not disclose a guideline having a specific or constant tension via a tension winch. McDonell et al. disclose a downhaul line 36 and downhaul winch 58 at a specific or constant tension (C2/L45-60) such that during raising and lowering of passenger capsules the retrieving vessel or platform to compensate for instability brought on by wave action. C1/L15-29. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Edwards to include a guideline having a specific or constant tension via a tension winch, as per the teachings of MacDonell et al., to compensate for wave action make personnel transfer safer.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards.

With respect to claim 14, Edwards does not explicitly disclose a passenger seat. However, Edwards discloses rescuing humans from disabled and sunken vessels by lifting humans in a life-supporting bell. Thus, a skilled artisan would either fit seats into the interior space or allow passengers to sit on the bell structure itself. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edwards bell to include passengers seats, be it the bell itself or add on seats as known in the art of seating.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory W. Adams whose telephone number is (571) 272-8101. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saul Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-7097. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GWA

